

Application No.: 10/047,929
Page 4

Attorney Docket No.: J38.2P-9535-US02

Remarks

In the Final Office Action dated November 14, 2003 claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Clark (US Des. 264,424). Claim 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Smith (US 6,438,785). Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lisowski (US 5,937,473) in view of Urie, Jr. et al (US 5,505,154). Claim 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified invention of Lisowski and further in view of Nunziato (US 3,993,013). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lisowski in view of Urie, Jr. et al, and further in view of Cave (US 2,289,313).

In speaking with the Examiner on December 12, 2003, the claim language of amended claim 1 and new claim 10 was found acceptable and put the application in condition for allowance as further searching was not necessary. Applicant cancels claims 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 8 was amended for purposes of maintaining consistent antecedent basis. No new matter has been added with these amendments or with new claim 13.

It is believed that the rejections listed above have been overcome with the amendments.

Conclusion

In light of the above, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that pending claims 1-3, 8, and 10 are in condition for allowance. Early notification of such is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: December 15, 2003

By: Brendan Babcock
Brendan Babcock
Registration No. 50,705

Suite 2000
6109 Blue Circle Drive
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone No.: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile No.: (952) 563-3001
\\VAS01FCMATTERS\\09535US02\\9535US02_AMD_1209-03.DOC